

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were examined in the final office action mailed on 10/02/2007 (hereafter "First Final Office Action"). All the claims were rejected.

By virtue of this paper, claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 13-16, 18 and 20-22 are sought to be amended, claims 23-26 are sought to be cancelled and new claims 28-30 are sought to be newly added. The amendments, cancellations and additions are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments, cancellations and additions are made without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-22 and 27-30 are thus respectfully presented for consideration further in view of the below remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0149629 issued to Craycroft *et al* (hereafter "Craycroft") in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101444 issued to Novak *et al* (hereafter "Novak") and US Patent No. 6,469,714 issued to Buxton *et al* (hereafter "Buxton").

Without acquiescing to any of the assertions in the First Final Office Action, it is asserted that the claims as presented are allowable over the art of record.

For example, currently amended claim 1 (as well as other independent claims) expressly recite that an experience profile is specified associated **with an electronic file storing data**, which (data) is **then provided access to users** according to the experience profile.

Even assuming arguendo that the claimed experience profile can somehow be equated with the GUI panels of Buxton, the above-noted feature is clearly not taught or reasonably suggested by the art of record, as explained below.

The Examiner relies partly on Buxton in rejecting claim 1, and in that regard asserts, among other points, as follows:

Buxton teaches a second set of values for controlling a second electronic file (i.e. step 606 in FIG. 6 et seq. of Buxton).

(Page 3, lines 9-10 of the First Final Office Action)

...

Applicant argued that Buxton fails to teach associating different experience profiles to different electronic files accessed by the same application.

Examiner disagrees.

Buxton teaches this limitation. Buxton's application associates different profiles with different electronic files, (figure 7, items 700, 702, 704, 706, and 708; column 16, lines 5-50; for example, spread sheet is associated with a different interface profile than that of a word document).

(Page 11 line 18 to page 12 line 4 of the First Final Office Action)

It is respectfully noted that the customization to graphical user interfaces of Buxton is for **applications** (e.g., Java Beans, Applets, Components, as shown in Figure 2 of Buxton). The Examiner appears to equate different applications of Buxton with the claimed electronic files.

It is Applicants position that the applications of Buxton (equated by the Examiner to the claimed electronic files) **do not store the data, which is accessed by users**. Rather the applications there may retrieve data from external sources and provide the data.

In support of the assertion that the **accessed** data of Buxton is provided external to such applications, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the below disclosure of Buxton:

The InfoCenter communicates with applets executing in the same environment via an information bus architecture referred to hereafter as the InfoBus. The architecture of the InfoBus is described in the publicly accessible specification entitled InfoBus Specification 1.1.1 available from Lotus Development Corp. and is the subject of the copending U.S. patent applications referenced in the Related Applications Section of this application. It is described in part hereafter for the reader's benefit with reference to FIG. 5. The InfoBus architecture enables developers to create a new class of dynamic applications in which data exchange is based on information content. ***For example, a single database access component can offer the InfoBus information from a wide variety of databases.***

5 The information on the InfoBus is dynamically tagged by its
content. Data consumers such as a charting or reporting
component can receive the data based on the dynamic tags. In
addition, in the contemplated embodiment, the InfoBus
architecture provides mechanisms for transmitting
highly-structured data such as keyed rows in a collection. As
a member of the InfoBus, any exchange information with any other
component in a structured way. Simple items like strings and
numbers and complex items like lists, arrays and tables can be
tagged over the virtual information bus. For example, a
10 component could provide a user interface that allows users to
select an item, such as an account number, and publish the
selected item on the InfoBus. ***In response, a second component
lists names for the account number, could look up information
from an external database and publish it in a table of results
over the InfoBus.*** Finally, a third component, such as a
spreadsheet, could access this result table and display it or use
it for further analysis. Developers build InfoBus applications
by presenting a set of cooperating components in a design
environment, such as a HTML document or a webpage. The
20 components communicate via the InfoBus making it possible to
divide the application into manageable pieces.
(Col. 10, lines 10-45 of Buxton, ***Emphasis Added***)

25 Accordingly, the customizations of Buxton are merely for the Applications used to
access data, but not for the claimed electronic files **storing** accessed data.

Thus, Buxton does not disclose or reasonably suggest the above noted feature of
currently amended claim 1.

30 Craycroft and Novak do not cure that deficiency, as appears to also be conceded by
the Examiner. In particular, it is Applicant's position that Craycroft merely provides
customization of desktop, which affects the appearance and behavior of various windows, but
there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed ability to associate different experience
profiles to different electronic files accessed by the **same application**. Further, the skins of
35 Novak appear to be associated with the application (and is thus not akin to the claimed
electronic files).

It is accordingly concluded that the invention of currently amended claim 1 is
allowable over the art of record. Currently amended claim 14 is also allowable over the art
40 of record at least for similar reasons.

Claims 2-9, 27 and 28 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 15-22 depend on claim 14 and are also allowable for similar reasons.

Currently amended claim 5 is independently allowable over the art of record for several reasons. For example, currently amended claim 5 recites, among other features, that an association information indicating the respective experience profiles associated with the corresponding electronic files, is stored.

In that regard, it was asserted:

Regarding dependent claim 5, see the analysis of claim 1 above. Craycroft, in combination with Novak and Buxton teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

Craycroft teaches **storing an association information indicating** that said first experience profile is associated with said first electronic file. (i.e. **compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak, also compare change in theme in FIGS. 2C-2E et seq. of Craycroft**).

Novak teaches said second experience profile is associated with said second electronic file. (i.e. compare Figs. 18-22 et seq. of Novak).

(Page 4, lines 11-17 of the First Final Office Action, **Emphasis Added**)

With respect to Novak, even assuming the scripts of Figures 18-22 of Novak can somehow be equated to the claimed experience profiles, it is pointed out that the scripts there relate to 'skins' which in turn affect the visual display of the user interface of the application. As such the scripts of Novak would change the visual display of the user interface irrespective of what is accessed by the application there. Accordingly, Novak does not disclose or reasonably suggest the claimed association information.

With respect to Craycroft, the themes of Figures 2C-2E there, would affect the entire desktop or user interface, again irrespective of the specific content/files being accessed, as demonstrated in Figures 2C-2E. Accordingly, Craycroft also does not disclosure or reasonably suggest the claimed association information.

Accordingly, currently amended claim 5 is independently allowable over the art of record.

Currently amended claim 7 is also independently allowable over the art of record in reciting that **experience attributes specified associated with a first electronic file (which is edited using an application)** indicates that a music file is to be played using **another** application.

In other words, the application used for editing is different/separate from the another application playing music in accordance with claim 7.

The Examiner relies on the song list in Fig. 14, 18-21 and steps 1202-1204 in Fig. 12 of Novak in rejecting claim 7. These portions do not teach several of the claimed features as explained below.

For example, currently amended claim 7 requires that the experience attribute **be associated with the electronic file that is edited**. Even assuming arguendo that the song list of Novak can be equated to the claimed first electronic file, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Novak that the skins are specified associated with the song list.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Novak that the editing of the song list is **by a different application than the one that plays the songs**.

At least for one of the two reasons noted above, currently amended claim 7 is allowable over the art of record.

Currently amended claim 8 is also independently allowable in reciting the order in which the values specified by different entities are overridden. In particular, the example there recites that the value specified by operating system default, the application default, the experience profile (for the specific electronic file) for the same attribute are overridden in that order.

The claimed **three level combination** (operating system, application and experience profile) is not disclosed or reasonably suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, currently amended claim 8 is independently allowable over the art of record.

5 New claim 28 recites that a value internal to the electronic file for the same attribute overrides any of the values in the three levels noted above.

In other words, in accordance with claim 28, the claimed experience profile (provided associated with an electronic file) falls in the **third position (i.e., between application defaults and internal values)** in the claimed sequence of overriding.

10 The references of record, either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest such a sequence of overriding. Accordingly, new claim 28 is independently allowable over the art of record.

15 Currently amended claim 9 is also independently allowable in reciting that experience profiles available for association **with individual ones of specific electronic files** are displayed.

20 The Examiner relies on Figure 18-21 and steps 1202/1204 of Figure 12 of Novak in rejecting the previously examined claim 9. Even assuming arguendo that the skins of Novak can be equated to the claimed experience profiles, it is respectfully noted that the skins there are not displayed for association with individual electronic files, as claimed.

25 Accordingly, currently amended claim 9 is independently allowable over the art of record.

Currently amended independent claim 10 is also allowable over the art of record. It is first noted that the claim recites:

- (1) two different applications (a first application and a second application);

- (2) specifying a value with an experience attribute in association with a first electronic file opened using the first application; and
- (3) causing **the second application to control the experience attribute** according to the value specified while **providing access to the data stored in the first electronic file using the first application.**

5

Applicants are unclear on to which specific elements/teachings of the art of record the Examiner relies on in rejecting claim 10. As a threshold matter, it is noted that the Examiner relies on identical portions of the references in rejecting claim 1 and 10, though the scope of the two claims are different. For example, claim 1 recites the operation of a single application, while claim 10 recites two different applications. It is accordingly respectfully requested that the Examiner clearly point out the specific elements/teachings of the references to which claimed features are being mapped so that the Applicants can appropriately address the rejection. Irrespective, to further prosecution, Applicants offer the following remarks.

10

15

For example, none of the references of record teach or reasonably suggests feature 3 noted above. Currently amended claim 10 is accordingly allowable over the art of record. Claims 11-13 depend from claim 10 and are allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 10.

20

Each of claims 11 and 12 is independently allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 7 (since the value is to be specified associated with the editable electronic file).

25

New independent claim 29 is allowable over the art of record in reciting the manner in which the respective data in a first electronic file (having an associated experience profile) and a second electronic file (having **no** associated experience profile) is provided access by the **same** application.

30

In particular, when there is an associated experience profile (as in, for the first electronic file), a value specified for an attribute in the experience profile overrides any value

provided for the same attribute as a default value by application or operating system default, but is overridden by any value specified (for the same attribute) internal to the (first) electronic file.

On the other hand, when there is no associated experience profile (as in, for the second electronic file), the value of an experience attribute is determined by the operating system/application defaults overridden by any value specified (for the same attribute) internal to the (second) electronic file.

The art of record clearly does not disclose or reasonably suggest claimed sequence of overriding in the two claimed scenarios.

New claim 29 is accordingly allowable over the art of record. New claim 30 depends on claim 29 and is allowable at least for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 29.

Conclusion

Accordingly all the objections and rejections of record are believed to be overcome and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Continuation of examination is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Date: January 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,
/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/
Signature
Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta
Attorney for Applicant
Registration Number: 41,416